

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/575,554	04/10/2006	Yoshiaki Hirose	YMUCP011	8941	
22434 Weaver Austin	7590 01/25/201 Villeneuve & Sampso	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 70250			GREGORIO, GUINEVER S		
OAKLAND, C	CA 94612-0250		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1793			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/25/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/575,554	HIROSE, YOSHIAKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
GUINEVER S. GREGORIO	1793		

	GUINEVER S. GREGORIO	1793					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
∑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places that application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 To Ref. 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 3 To CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) a:				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>						
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims					
NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendments will not			imited "other				
than vapor-deposited graphite fibers" or "natural gr	raphite or kish graphite". The propo	sed claims are broad	er an thus wou				
require further consideration. (See 37 CFR 1.116							
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> </ol>	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	rided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach-	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. 🔲 Other:							
/Melvin Curtis Maves/	(OUNEVED O COSTO	DIO					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	/GUINEVER S GREGO	KIU/					

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner is not convinced that the invention taught by Shane et al. (Pat. No. 3,404,601) would not produce a product which would meet the limitations red by Applicant cites column 12, line 22 where Shane et al. teaches a preliminary measurement of the thermal conductivities for the graphite sheet at a particular temperature. Examiner believes that the graphite sheet taught by Shane et al. would be able to meet the thermal conductivity limitation claimed by Applicant if the thermal conductivity mere taken at a different temperature.

Furthermore, Noromichi (Japanese Pat, No. JP-2566244) cited in a previous office action expressly teaches a graphite sheet with thermal conductivity greater than 140 W/m K which would obviouslly encompass Applicant's claimed thermal conductivity.